

Report of the Accreditation Re-visit to National Hispanic University

Professional Services Division

June 30, 2000

Overview

This item provides information about the accreditation re-visit to National Hispanic University that was conducted on May 22-24, 2000. This item provides the report of the re-visit and subsequent accreditation recommendations.

Staff Recommendations

1. On the basis of the re-visit accreditation team report, staff recommends that the stipulations placed upon National Hispanic University by the Committee on Accreditation be removed.
2. Staff recommends that the Committee on Accreditation change the accreditation status of the National Hispanic University from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation" based upon the removal of the above stipulations.

Background Information

A COA accreditation team conducted a visit at the National Hispanic University on May 24-26, 1999. On the basis of the accreditation team report, the COA made the following accreditation decision for the National Hispanic University and its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence of the active involvement of the faculty in the governance of the program. The involvement must include sufficient full-time faculty to maintain effective coordination and management of the program.
- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive program evaluation system, involving the required constituencies, that collects data, analyzes it, and uses the information gathered for program changes and improvement, as needed.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of systematic procedures for the selection, orientation and evaluation of all master teachers.
- That the institution provide evidence of a clearly articulated program design based upon a conceptual framework which explains the rationale for the delivery system.
- That the institution provide evidence of a clear and focused incorporation of English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) instructional strategies throughout the program.

- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive and cohesive process of guidance, assistance and feedback for student teachers.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a final assessment process that is consistent with all of the elements of the standard.

The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare for a re-visit within one year of the accreditation action. The institution prepared a document indicating how each of the stipulations had been addressed and what changes had been made in areas of the standards identified by the team as needing attention. The institution prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. A three member re-visit team, all of whom were members of the original team, spent three days at the institution in a focused re-visit. Prior to the re-visit at National Hispanic, staff and the team leader reviewed a schedule of interviews to ensure all individuals connected to the program concerns were included. After the interviews on campus and school site visits, the team prepared an accreditation report that was presented to the institution. It is now provided to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration and action.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM RE-VISIT REPORT**

Institution: National Hispanic University

Dates of Re-Visit: May 22-24, 2000

Accreditation Re-Visit

Team Recommendation: ACCREDITATION

Rationale: On May 22-24, 2000, the original team conducted a focused revisit. The focus included attention to seven stipulations that were recommended in the original report related to; Common Standards 1, 2, 4, and 8; Multiple Subject Program Standards 1, 2, 6, 9, and 21.

The Provost and faculty of NHU prepared a document that responded to each of the stipulations noted above.

The Team reviewed documents and conducted extensive interviews as listed below. On the basis of the Institutional Response to the Stipulations, supporting evidence, and interviews and the fact that all Standards less than fully met have been addressed, the Team recommends that the stipulations be removed and that the Accreditation status be changed from Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations to Accreditation.

Team Leader: Charles G. Zartman, Jr.
California State University, Chico

Team Member: Priscilla Walton
University of California, Santa Cruz

Team Member: Clara Chapala
California Department of Education

DATA SOURCES

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
8	Program Faculty	x	Catalog
6	Institutional Administration	x	Institutional Self Study
40	Candidates	x	Course Syllabi
5	Graduates		Candidate Files
13	Employers of Graduates	x	Fieldwork Handbook
5	Supervising Practitioners	x	Follow-up Survey Results
2	Advisors	x	Needs Analysis Results
13	School Administrators	x	Information Booklet
0	Credential Analyst	x	Faculty & Advisory Board Minutes
8	Advisory Committee	x	Schedule of Classes
		x	Advisement Documents
		x	Faculty Vitae
		x	Student Evaluations

Findings and Recommendations Related to COA Stipulations

Stipulation #1

- That the institution provide evidence of the active involvement of the faculty in the governance of the program. The involvement must include sufficient full-time faculty to maintain effective coordination and management of the program.

Revisit Team Findings

The institution has provided substantial evidence of faculty participation in the governance of the program. Interviews with faculty as well as a review of minutes of meetings provide evidence of increased involvement of faculty. Documented evidence of meetings and minutes of meetings indicate that faculty have been involved in all decisions and ongoing development of the program during the past year. This also includes the involvement of full-time faculty who effectively coordinate and manage the program.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Stipulation #2

- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive program evaluation system, involving the required constituencies, that collects data, analyzes it, and uses the information gathered for program changes and improvement, as needed.

Revisit Team Findings

Interviews and documents confirm that a comprehensive program evaluation has been developed and implemented. The evaluation system includes all participants in the program. Data are collected from the various constituencies (candidates, graduates of the program, master teachers, faculty, and employers), analyzed, and used for substantive program changes and improvement. Program changes are reviewed by an active advisory board.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Stipulation #3

- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of systematic procedures for the selection, orientation and evaluation of all master teachers.

Revisit Team Findings

A systematic procedure for the selection, orientation, and evaluation of Master Teachers has been implemented. There is a Master Teacher orientation relative to program goals and Master Teacher expectations. In addition, Master Teachers are observed for their suitability. There is documentation that CLAD and BCLAD student teachers are appropriately placed with appropriately credentialed teachers.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Stipulation #4

- That the institution provide evidence of a clearly articulated program design based upon a conceptual framework which explains the rationale for the delivery system.

Revisit Team Findings

The program has developed a conceptual framework based on the six major points in the conceptual framework, including meta-cognition, exploration learning, technology, cultural literacy, community literacy, and service learning. The institution will need to continue to refine and align the coursework and field experiences with this conceptual framework.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Stipulation #5

- That the institution provide evidence of a clear and focused incorporation of English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) instructional strategies throughout the program.

Revisit Team Findings

There is substantial evidence that the program has incorporated ELD and SDAIE strategies in all of the courses. This has been verified by interviews with candidates, faculty, and master teachers and documented lesson plans during the student teaching experience.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Stipulation #6

- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive and cohesive process of guidance, assistance and feedback for student teachers.

Revisit Team Findings

The institution has addressed this stipulation by hiring full time faculty who serve as the Coordinator of University Supervision and Coordinator of Academic Advising. Both interviews with students and employers indicate that candidates are receiving guidance and feedback in a timely fashion in program requirements, required coursework, and field experiences. The institution developed a Student Teaching Handbook which has been disseminated to both candidates and master teachers. Candidates consistently reported that all requests for assistance or information are addressed within 24 hours.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Stipulation #7

- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a final assessment process that is consistent with all of the elements of the standard.

Revisit Team Findings

A summative assessment process has been developed and implemented. The university supervisor, master teacher and program director participate in this process. This was documented by a review of various assessment instruments and interviews.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Findings and Recommendations Related to Common Standards

Original Team Decision:

Common Standard 1	Educational Leadership	Standard Met Minimally
		Quantitative Concerns

The National Hispanic University received waiver approval for offering a Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD program in 1994. The institution initiated an internship program in conjunction with the Alum Rock Union School District in 1998. The program has been developed to be consistent with the institutional mission which supports “. . . using a multi-cultural educational experience to obtain a professional career, . . .” through its emphasis on “high expectations to encourage academic success, a support system to enhance achievement, and role models to provide a success oriented attitude.” The institution is located in a strategic geographic location. Under the leadership of the President, Provost and Teacher Education Director, the institution has demonstrated a consistent ability to attract and retain students who have previously given up on college. The institution has a growing presence in the region.

Though the program has experienced high faculty and staff turnover in recent years, steps have been taken to solidify the schedule of course offerings, clarify the focus of the program, involve the faculty in decision-making, and strengthen the program. Although the institutional mission and vision are clearly articulated on paper, and some positive steps to involve the largely adjunct faculty have been taken, the program has been operated mostly without the active involvement of faculty in its governance.

Revisit Team Findings

It is clear that the institution has turned a corner under its current leadership team. It has documented evidence of high faculty involvement in governance. Throughout the last year the faculty and administration have met regularly and reviewed and revised the program. Their work has then been presented to an active advisory board that has provided substantive input at all levels of the program.. All constituencies interviewed during the revisit noted a high level of participation by the faculty and advisory committee. The institution has implemented a vision designed to meet the needs of the local community. The program has been revised and strengthened since the 1999 visit with the full participation of not only faculty but administrators and practitioners. It is clear that N.H.U. has taken all CTC recommendations to heart, and seriously acted on them.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team found that the Team’s concerns of the previous year have been addressed and the standard is now met.

Original Team Decision:**Common Standard 2****Resources****Standard Met Minimally****Quantitative Concerns**

Within the last five years, significant steps have been taken to transform a former elementary school located on a ten-acre parcel of land into a fully functioning institution of higher education. The vision for full build out of the campus is ambitious. The program of the institution has experienced rapid growth and now serves over 250 candidates with one full time faculty member, one recently selected full-time faculty member, six adjunct faculty members available to teach courses, two part-time field supervisors, and additional support personnel. The team gathered evidence through review of documents and interviews that this low distribution of full-time personnel makes it difficult to maintain effective coordination and management of the program.

Revisit Team Findings

The institution addressed concerns relative to this standard over the past year. They have increased the number of full time faculty from two full time faculty and six adjunct faculty to three full time faculty, six full time equivalent faculty on two year contracts, two adjunct part time faculty teaching two classes each, and seven adjunct faculty each teaching one course. The increase in faculty and attention to coordination issues by the faculty are now ensuring a well-coordinated and managed program.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team found that the Team's concerns of the previous year have been addressed and the standard is now met.

Original Team Decision:**Common Standard 4****Evaluation****Standard Not Met**

There is no evidence of the existence of a comprehensive evaluation design and criteria, involving the required participants, that systematically collects data, analyzes it, and uses the information gathered for program change and improvement. For example, there is no evidence of the following:

- Formal information from graduates of the program
- Involvement of practitioners, such as master teachers, in providing feedback to the program.
- Faculty input into evaluation and development of the program.

There appear to be a number of instances in which the institution has responded to concerns. However, this information is received in an informal and unsystematic way and not as a part of a comprehensive system. The participation of districts in a more formal ongoing evaluation system of the program is not evident.

Students regularly evaluate the faculty. The results from these evaluations are used to make decisions about retention. It was not clear how the course evaluations are used to improve the content of instruction beyond the removal of unsuitable faculty.

Revisit Team Findings

The program has developed and implemented a comprehensive evaluation system.

It is fully in place with data collected and used to inform the program. Candidates, faculty, graduates, and employers of graduates have all completed surveys relative to program

effectiveness. Institutional leadership used the results to make personnel decisions and enhance specific program elements.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team found that the Team's concerns of the previous year have been addressed and the standard is now met.

Original Team Decision:

Common Standard 8 District Field Supervisors

Standard Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns

The institution has memoranda of understanding with several school districts for student teacher placements and employment. However, the selection, orientation and evaluation of all Master Teachers is uneven. Some students reported effective support and interaction with Master Teachers. Others did not have Master Teacher supervision. The recent hiring of a faculty member to develop and coordinate student advisement and field placement should strengthen this component and assure that supervising staff will be appropriately selected, trained, evaluated and recognized.

Revisit Team Findings

N.H.U. has established uniform practices relative to the selection, orientation, and Evaluation of Master Teachers. Master teachers are now presented with job Descriptions, policies, and must sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) prior to commencing service. An orientation process has been put in place for all Master Teachers, and a systematic evaluation instrument has been initiated which is used to both recognize effective and eliminate ineffective Master Teachers. Master teachers are given a \$100 stipend for their service to the university. The university now also sponsors an event to acknowledge the contributions of outstanding teachers.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team found that the Team's concerns of the previous year have been addressed and the standard is now met.

Response and Recommendations Related to Program Standards

Multiple Subject: CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis

Multiple Subject: CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Internship

Original Team Decision:

Standard 1 – Program Design, Rationale and Coordination

Not Met

The program design was not clearly articulated in either the self-study report or presentation to the team. The program described in the self-study is not the program as it exists in practice. The current program has been organized to meet the needs of candidates employed by local school districts under emergency permit authorizations. Elements for an effective program are in place, however, the program lacks a conceptual framework which explains rationale for the delivery system. The absence of the clearly articulated design based upon a rationale inhibits the effective coordination of the program

Revisit Team Findings

The program presents its sequence of courses in one-month modules. This delivery system is highly effective for working teachers. Candidates expressed great satisfaction with this design. The program articulates a mission to serve the local teaching needs of the surrounding community. It expressly works to recruit and bring into teaching underrepresented groups. Program content has been organized around six basic concepts that increase in complexity as the student moves through the coursework. In other words, the curriculum is spiraled and each phase iterates the former. The six concepts include the following:

- Meta-cognition and meta-cognitive awareness
- Constructivism
- Cultural and linguistic literacy for the local context and for a global society
- Community Context for learning and teaching
- Service learning
- Technology in the educational context

Faculty, candidates, and other participants in the program are now able to articulate a common understanding of the program.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team found that the Team's concerns of the previous year have been addressed and the standard is now met.

Original Team Decision:

Standard 2 – Development of Professional Perspectives Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns

Faculty have dedicated considerable effort to ensure that each candidate develops an extensive professional knowledge base. Candidates, graduates and employers have determined that the content in professional preparation courses serves to develop professional perspective. Although candidates and graduates commented that they feel prepared to serve all students, a strand is missing that includes a clear and focused incorporation of English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) instructional strategies.

Revisit Team Findings

Program faculty have integrated ELD/SDAIE strategies across the curriculum. They attended a series of workshops that addressed the use of English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) instructional strategies in program coursework. Faculty now require that candidates submit lesson plans in each course which detail the specific strategies that provide English Language Learners with access to academic content. Candidates have been given criteria for successful lessons, and have reviewed these criteria through course discussions, assignments, and classroom practice.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team found that the Team's concerns of the previous year have been addressed and the standard is now met.

Original Team Decision:

Standard 6 – Preparation for Student Teaching Responsibilities

**Met Minimally with
Quantitative concerns**

There is a concern about the extent of focus in the curriculum on ELD/SDAIE methodologies and, for BCLAD candidates, primary language instructional strategies.

Revisit Team Findings

As indicated in the findings related to Program Standard 2 above, the program has increased the amount of content related to ELD/SDAIE and primary language instruction methodologies.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team found that the Team's concerns of the previous year have been addressed and the standard is now met.

Original Team Decision:

Standard 9 – Guidance, Assistance and Feedback

**Met Minimally with
Quantitative concerns**

A comprehensive and cohesive feedback process is not evenly implemented. In some cases candidates received minimal feedback from school personnel and in other cases, university supervisors and master teachers did not coordinate their information about candidate progress. A process is not evident that ensures a uniform implementation of the feedback loop at each school site for each candidate.

Revisit Team Findings

The Team found a marked difference in feedback from candidates relative to this standard. Program personnel are seen as organized, attentive, and accessible at all times. Advice and assistance are now excellent features of the program. Documentation indicated that students receive feedback from advisors, faculty, university supervisors, and Master teachers. The various constituencies are communicating and offering supportive and necessary feedback for candidates throughout their time in the program. The institution has hired a person whose primary function is to provide assistance and guidance to students. Feedback and responsiveness of faculty and student teacher supervisor is also evident.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team found that the Team's concerns of the previous year have been addressed and the standard is now met.

Original Team Decision:

Standard 21-Determination of Candidate Competence

Not Met

Although there is a final assessment process that is used, based upon the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, the process does not formally include all of the elements of the standard and does not specifically address Program Standards 11-20. The team was unable to find evidence that candidates were evaluated according to those standards.

Revisit Team Findings

N.H.U. has implemented a formal assessment process that addresses all standards. A summative assessment involves the program director, master teacher and the university supervisor. This assessment incorporates all elements in Program Standards 11-20. In addition, each candidate compiles a Portfolio based on criteria aligned with the elements in Program Standards 11-20 and participates in an exit interview prior to recommendation for the credential.

Revisit Team Recommendation

The Team found that the Team's concerns of the previous year have been addressed and the standard is now met.

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

The team noted that the institution has made significant changes in response to the original report. The team wishes to acknowledge the dedicated efforts of the faculty, administration, and staff of the National Hispanic University for their accomplishments over the last year in attending to the stipulations and concerns included in the 1999 accreditation team report. The institution can take pride in the progress made over the past year to improve teacher preparation at NHU.

The initial mission of the institution to serve Hispanic students has broadened to include a range of students from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds, including individuals who are changing careers and paraprofessionals on career ladders.

The campus is attracting individuals with strong academic backgrounds who are committed to the mission of the university. There is consensus among candidates interviewed that the following characteristics have attracted them to the program. These include a flexible delivery system, individual attention, size of the institution, the quality of the instruction by highly qualified staff, and a practical focus in all courses. These unique features serve the immediate needs of teachers on emergency permits and internship credentials. The attractiveness of the program is exemplified by the candidates' willingness to drive extraordinary distances to participate in this program (i.e., Stockton, Salinas, Santa Cruz, Watsonville)

The institution continues to establish successful partnerships that are acknowledged by neighboring institutions of higher education and local education agencies.

While the institution has infused ELD/SDAIE throughout the coursework, a separate ESL(ELD) methods course would further strengthen the program.